

## REMARKS

### 1. Introduction

In the final Office Action mailed July 28, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee, U.S. Patent No. 6,385,435 (“Lee”) in view of Kim, U.S. Pub. No. 2001/0046215 (“Kim”) and in further view of Trompower et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,128,512 (“Trompower”). The Examiner rejected claims 7-9 and 11-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Trompower and further in view of Leslie et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,404,775 (“Leslie”). The Examiner rejected claims 3, 6, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Kim and Trompower and further in view of Sabat, Jr. et al., U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0016170 (“Sabat”). The Examiner rejected claims 10, 14, 16, 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Kim, Trompower, and Leslie and further in view of Sabat. The Examiner rejected claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Kim, Trompower, and Leslie and further in view of what the Examiner alleged was well known in the art.

In this response, Applicants have amended claims 2, 3, 5-7, 11, 17, and 18, canceled claims 1, 4, 15, and 16, and added new claims 19-22.

For the reasons set forth below, Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of the claims as amended.

## **2. Response to Claim Rejections**

### **a. Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 19-22**

Of these claims, newly-added claims 19, 20, 21, and 22 are independent. Claims 19 and 21 are directed to a method for overcoming pilot pollution in a geographical area and claims 20 and 22 are directed to an apparatus for overcoming pilot pollution in a geographical area. More particularly, claims 19 and 21 recite, *inter alia*, amplifying a preferred pilot signal to provide a boosted pilot signal and transmitting the boosted pilot signal within the geographical area, “wherein the boosted pilot signal dominates over a polluting pilot signal within the geographical area.” Claims 20 and 22 recite, *inter alia*, an amplifier that provides a boosted pilot signal, “wherein the strength of the boosted pilot signal is adjusted to dominate over a polluting pilot signal within the geographical area.”

Applicants recognize that the Examiner has previously rejected (in the first Office Action) claims directed to overcoming pilot pollution in a geographical area. In particular, the Examiner cited Lee as disclosing a repeater system in which a signal received by the repeater antenna is amplified and retransmitted in a geographical area, such as a “shadow zone.” Applicants submit, however, that Lee does not disclose amplifying the received signal such that it dominates over a polluting pilot signal within the geographical area. Applicants further submit that the other prior art of record does not make up for this deficiency in Lee.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 19, 20, 21, and 22 are allowable over Lee and the other prior art of record for at least the foregoing reasons. Applicants further submit that claims 2, 3, 5, and 6 are allowable for at least the reason that the claims are dependent on allowable claims.

**b. Claims 7-14, 17, and 18**

Of these claims, claims 7, 11, 17, and 18 are independent. The Examiner has rejected claims 7 and 11 under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee, in view of Kim, Trompower, and Leslie and has rejected claims 17 and 18 under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee, in view of Kim, Trompower, Leslie, and Sabat. In these rejections, the Examiner has cited Lee as disclosing retransmitting a repeated signal into a “shadow area” and has argued that such disclosure reads on the claimed transmission “substantially only along a boundary between the first and second geographical areas.” The Examiner has also argued that it would have been obvious to modify Lee to include the retransmission of a pilot signal, as disclosed by Kim, in order to increase the coverage area of a base station.

In response, Applicants have amended claims 7, 11, 17, and 18 to specify that the selected base station from which the preferred pilot signal is received also “provides wireless coverage in the second geographical area,” i.e., the geographical area in which the boosted pilot signal is transmitted. Thus, in the amended claims, a pilot signal from a selected base station is boosted and transmitted into an area in which the selected base station *already provides* wireless coverage. This approach stands in sharp contrast to Lee’s approach of retransmitting a repeated signal into a “shadow area.” In particular, the base station transmissions in the “shadow zone” in Lee are too weak to be used (col. 1, lines 15-24). Thus, the amendments to claims 7, 11, 17, and 18 clearly distinguish over Lee.

These amendments also render inapplicable the Examiner’s rationale for modifying Lee in view of Kim, i.e., the rationale of increasing the coverage area of the base station. In particular, in claims 7, 11, 17, and 18, as amended, the pilot signal from the selected base station is boosted and transmitted into an area in which the selected base station already provides

wireless coverage. Thus, the coverage area of the selected base station is *not* necessarily increased. Instead, the transmission “substantially only along a boundary between the first and second geographical areas” is done in order to force a hand-off within the cellular wireless system on crossing the boundary from the first geographical area to the second geographical area.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 7, 11, 17, and 18 are allowable over Lee, Kim, and the other prior art of record for at least the foregoing reasons. Applicants further submit that claims 8-10 and 12-14 are allowable for at least the reason that the claims are dependent on allowable claims.

### 3. Conclusion

Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is hereby requested. Should the Examiner feel that further dialog would advance the subject application to issuance, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at any time at (312) 913-0001.

Respectfully submitted,

**McDONNELL BOEHNEN  
HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP**

Dated: August 22, 2005

By: Richard A. Machonkin  
Richard A. Machonkin  
Reg. No. 41,962